



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

m2

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,284	07/18/2003	Pohsiang Hsu	3382-66128	4607

26119 7590 03/30/2007
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN LLP
121 S.W. SALMON STREET
SUITE 1600
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

PATEL, JAYESH A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
31 DAYS	03/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/622,284

Applicant(s)

HSU ET AL.

Examiner

Jayesh A. Patel

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-59 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1,54 and 37, are drawn to “a method of processing video images in a video sequence using 4:1:1 format macroblocks”, classified in class 382, subclass 164.
- II. Claim 8, drawn to “a method of encoding video images in a sequence by classifying a macroblock in an interlaced video”, classified in class 382, subclass 232.
- III. Claims 9,15 and 57 drawn to “a method of encoding video images in interlaced video by sending encoded blocks in field order”, classified in class 348, subclass 420.1.
- IV. Claims 21,22,26 and 58 are drawn to “ a method of decoding a field-coded macroblock comprising an intra-coded and a second field by finding DC differential and value of the current block”, classified in class 375, subclass 240.13.
- V. Claims 33,34,43,47 and 59 are drawn to “ a method of encoding a macroblock using a motion vector”, classified in class 375, subclass 240.16.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions II and I are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the invention I has a separate utility such as processing video images in 4:1:1 format macroblocks and the invention II has separate utility such as classifying a block in an interlaced image. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions II and III are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the invention II has separate utility such as classifying a block in an interlaced image and III has separate utility such as encoding video images in interlaced video by sending encoded blocks in field order. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions II and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the invention II has separate utility such as classifying a block in an interlaced image and IV has separate utility such as a method of decoding a field-coded macroblock

comprising an intra-coded and a second field by finding DC differential and value of the current block. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions II and V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the invention II has separate utility such as classifying a block in an interlaced image and invention V has separate utility such as a method of encoding a macroblock using a motion vector. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions III and I are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the invention III has a separate utility such as encoding video images in interlaced video by sending encoded blocks in field order and invention I has separate utility such as processing video images in 4:1:1 format macroblocks. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions III and IV are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one

subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the invention III has a separate utility such as encoding video images in interlaced video by sending encoded blocks in field order and invention IV has separate utility such as a method of decoding a field-coded macroblock comprising an intra-coded and a second field by finding DC differential and value of the current block. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions III and V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, the invention III has a separate utility such as encoding video images in interlaced video by sending encoded blocks in field order and invention V has separate utility such as a method of encoding a macroblock using a motion vector. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions IV and I are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case invention IV has separate utility such as a method of decoding a field-coded macroblock comprising an intra-coded and a second field by finding DC differential and value

of the current block and invention I has a separate utility such as processing video images in 4:1:1 format macroblocks. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions IV and V are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case invention IV has separate utility such as a method of decoding a field-coded macroblock comprising an intra-coded and a second field by finding DC differential and value of the current block and invention V has a separate utility such as a method of encoding a macroblock using a motion vector. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Inventions V and I are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case the invention V has separate utility such as a method of encoding a macroblock using a motion vector and the invention I has a separate utility such as processing video images in 4:1:1 format macroblocks. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction

were not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper. Also these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jayesh A. Patel whose telephone number is 571-270-1227. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7.00am to 4.30 pm (5-4-9). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jingge Wu can be reached on 571-272-7429. The fax

phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jayesh Patel
03/28/07

JP

JINGGE WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER